DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 599 EA 008 541

AUTHOR	Jordan, Barbara; And Others
TITLE	Education Tomorrow: For Whom? Why?
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	44p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meeting and National Forum of the College Entrance Examination Board (New York, New York, October 26-28, 1975); For individual papers, see EA008542-547
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Civil Liberties; *Educational Finance; *Educational History; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Higher Education; *Political Influences; School Integration

ABSTRACT

This collection of six presentations is by no means a complete summary of the College Board's Annual Meeting and National Forum, but it represents the major subdivisions of the forum theme. Barbara Jordan, U.S. Representative from Texas, stresses the need for cooperation between educators and legislators in achieving the goal of equal opportunity. R. Freeman Butts, educational historian, points out that education has had at least seven distinct purposes--academic discipline, social efficiency, individual development, vocational competence, freedom, equality, and a just community. James S. Coleman, professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, discusses the problem of creating public policy that is responsive at once to two opposing principles--equality of opportunity and individual liberty. David Mathews, U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, concentrates on the work of the College Board. Maurice B. Mitchell, chancellor of the University of Denver, discusses the difficulties of educational managers in four main areas: economic problems, society's changing values and goals, educational standards, and educational planning. Ralph P. Davidson, publisher of "Time," calls education the cornerstone of democracy and urges the continued support of education at all levels.
(Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

EA 008 541

ED126599 - ED126605

Copyright © 1975 by College Entrance Examination Board.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Impact of Emerging Public Policy on Educational Planning. By Barbara Jordan	3 EA 008 542
The Search for Purpose in American Education By R. Freeman Butts	8 EA 008 543
Equality and Liberty in Education By James S. Coleman	16 EA 008 544
Perspectives in Education By David Mathews	23 EA 008 545
Educational Management: New Challenges for School and College Leaders. By Maurice B. Mitchell	26 EA 008 546
Education in a Changing Economy By Ralph P. Davidson	36 EA 008 547

INTRODUCTION

"Education Tomorrow: For Whom? Why?" was the theme chosen by the College Board's Seventy-Fifth Anniversary Steering Committee when it met last spring and summer to develop plans for the Board's special year of celebration and study. These educational leaders, headed by Norman C. Francis, president of Xavier University, chose this broad theme as a way of throwing open the regional and national forums to many of the issues that will help shape the character and spirit of education during the last quarter of the twentieth century.

The College Board's Annual Meeting and National Forum, held in New York City on October 26-28, was designed to be a catalyst for a year-long exercise of dialogue, introspection, and interaction between and among the diversity of institutions and their representatives who are at the heart of the College Board -- the membership.

The collection of six presentations that follows is by no means a complete summary of the three-day National Forum. Some two dozen other presentations were made by well-known educators during the course of the forum. But these six speeches represent the major subdivisions of the forum theme.

About the Speeches

Impact of Emerging Public Policy on Educational Planning is addressed by Barbara Jordan, U.S. Representative from Texas. She stresses the need for cooperation between educators and legislators in achieving the goal of equal opportunity.

The Search for Purpose in American Education is the title of a major presentation by R. Freeman Butts, educational historian and the William F. Russell Professor Emeritus in the Foundations of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. Concentrating on the 75 years since the founding of the College Board in 1900, Dr. Butts points out that education has had at least seven distinct purposes -- including academic discipline, social efficiency, individual development, vocational competence, freedom, equality, and a just community.

Equality and Liberty in Education is the topic of the speech delivered by James S. Coleman, professor of sociology, University of Chicago. Dr. Coleman discusses in detail the problems of creating public policy that is responsive at once to two opposing principles -- equality of opportunity and individual liberty. In the light of these two principles he addresses the educational and social problems associated with busing students and with school finance.

Perspectives in Education, delivered by David Mathews, U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, concentrates on the work of the College Board. Secretary Mathews urges the College Board to continue with research and development in the area of assessing knowledge acquired both by traditional and nontraditional means. He also points out the importance of research into techniques of validating practical experience for college credit, and improving links between the worlds of education and employment.

Educational Management: New Challenges for School and College Leaders presents the insights of Maurice B. Mitchell, chancellor of the University of Denver. Dr. Mitchell discusses the difficulties of educational managers in

four main areas: economic problems, society's changing values and goals, establishing standards, and planning effectively for future needs.

Education in a Changing Economy is addressed by Ralph P. Davidson, publisher of Time. The important role of mass communications in helping the American people make informed decisions is stressed by Mr. Davidson. Calling education the "cornerstone of democracy," he urges the continued support of education at all levels.

These papers do not present the answers to the questioning theme "Education Tomorrow: For Whom? Why?" If anything, they raise even more questions about equality of opportunity, the role of the federal government in education, the very purpose of the American educational system, and more. But they are a beginning, the catalyst sought after by the Anniversary Steering Committee. In the next round of forums, the regional meetings of the College Board membership, the process of discussion, debate, and idea-sharing will continue.

EA 008 542

ED126600

IMPACT OF EMERGING PUBLIC POLICY ON EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

By Barbara Jordan
United States Representative

I am not going to call my remarks education for whom, or for what, or why, because I could dispense with that speech very quickly. I could simply say I don't know. I don't know the answer to those questions, and yet you want me to talk about policy implications' impact for the future. I hope that what I have to say will spark some questions in your mind, and that as you deliberate for the next couple of days you will be able to come to grips with that big question -- education for whom? why?

This is your 75th anniversary observance. Anniversary observances are times to remember, to honor, if need be to redefine commitments. On such occasions we celebrate our origins, we give attention to where we are, where we want to go, and the means of getting there.

In this regard, our country commencing to celebrate its 200th anniversary and the College Board share certain similarities.

The College Board, as all of you know, is slightly more than one-third the age of the United States. You know that it evolved as an assemblage of a small group of Eastern college presidents, their attention focused 75 years ago on the problems common to them 75 years ago. Fortunately, this College Board did not remain mired in its origin but became a membership organization reflecting the diverse range of the educational spectrum, and it has that to its credit.

Where are the similarities? The founding fathers were a small group, just like the Eastern college presidents. What about them? How would you describe them? I would describe them as the landed gentry and the intellectual elite of 1787. They were fiercely protective of their own self-interest. They wrote a document. They wrote the Constitution. They began that document, "We, the people," and yet those three little words, "We, the people," would have excluded almost everybody in this room.

But the document that emerged took care of that. The Constitution was so elastic, you see, that this deficiency on the part of the founding fathers was ultimately remedied. As this country prepares for its bicentennial celebrations, it recalls the libertarian promises of the Declaration of Independence. One thing you must remember as you recall the libertarian promises of the Declaration is that a free public education was not promised. In 1776 nobody talked about free public education. It wasn't covered. As a matter of fact, we existed as a country for more than one-half a century before anybody ever thought of incorporating the concept of a free public education.

Fifty years, that's how long it took before the governmental policy makers began to attend to educational necessities. A long time, but by the mid-nineteenth century every state in the Union had some kind of statutory language, either in its annotated statutes or in its state constitution, that affirmed a free public education as a governmental responsibility.

There's something curious about that. Even though we had this kind of affirmation, there was nothing said about equal educational opportunity. Equal educational opportunity was not inherent in that affirmation of a free public education as a governmental responsibility. Even as late as October 25, 1975, we continue to stumble over the phrase "equal educational opportunity." We stumble. We, as citizens, are still unsure about what that means.

The long and tortuous path from Plessy vs. Ferguson to Brown vs. the Board of Education was piled high with difficulties. It was not an easy trek. Those difficulties and decisions focused on equality in education on the basis of the removal, the elimination of racial discrimination. But this is a very narrow kind of an approach. Left to be decided at some future time were the questions of inequality based on relative wealth, sex, handicaps both physical and mental. Equal educational opportunity was not a constitutionally guaranteed right for generations. The concept gradually, very gradually and very slowly, became a part of the collective consciousness of Congress and the courts, governors, and state legislative bodies.

Eventually the concept of an equal educational opportunity was cast into various written statements of goals and statements of purposes. Local, state, and national policies evolved. Policies continue to evolve right now, and the Congress through legislation endeavors as best we can to implement the public policy of an equal educational opportunity. Congress has not been creative; Congress has not been innovative; Congress has not come up with a new educational idea in a long time. And it will be a long time yet before the Congress develops a new basic educational policy. We are going to chart an educational course because that's our task, but we will pursue new policy directions only when the myriad intractable economic, social, and philosophical problems have been solved.

An overview of legislation that has been introduced this year suggests the political impetus of education for the present and for the immediate future -- not long range, immediate. Education is a very favorite subject of members of Congress. You can tell this by overviewing some of the more than 400 pieces of legislation that have been introduced in this present, 94th Congress. These pieces bear directly and indirectly on education, educational policy.

The 94th Congress tends to view education as a bridge, a bridge that will make the labor market more accessible to the ignorant, the unskilled, the poor, the unemployed, the handicapped. Each of these groups constitutes a constituency in and of itself, but each has only quite lately found its voice. These groups -- the poor, the unskilled, the handicapped -- now demand what they claim as their just due, whatever that is.

The Congress has to act on this kind of concern as expressed by these previously unrepresented groups. In an effort to straighten this link between the labor market and the disadvantaged, if we were to lump them all together, Congress is considering education in the areas of vocational and higher education. The National Institute of Education is receiving increasing Congressional attention. Not enough, but increasing.

The magnitude of education appropriations, especially for vocational and higher education, is indicative of the importance Congress attaches to these areas. It is also indicative of the impact of these groups, which we can lump together as the educationally disadvantaged, on the politician. We would like to think that those of us who are members of the Congress are statesmen who do not bend and yield and react and rise up and speak in response to some group that has suddenly become politically viable. But the fact of the matter is we do, and that is a fact of political life.

In the area of vocational education, Congress is now considering legislation that emphasizes the relationship between classroom training and the market's demands for particular skills. Under consideration is the authorization of up to a billion dollars, that's billion with a "B," for vocational education programs. Specifically targeted are those programs for the disadvantaged and the

handicapped. Other bills would provide career guidance, job placement, follow-up.

Such Congressional emphases perhaps are not politically or philosophically palatable to many of you. This kind of concentration of effort on the part of the members of Congress is not as a general rule philosophically palatable to those who occupy the hallowed halls of ivy. Considerable space in educational journals is devoted to the question of liberal education vis-a-vis career education. Perhaps I am unduly optimistic but I think I detect, at least I hope I detect, wider acceptance of the non-mutual exclusiveness of the two points of view.

Controversy notwithstanding, educational policy in a large part does emanate from the banks of the Potomac rather than from the groves of academe. You probably won't agree with that, but it's true. Like it or not. Policy is primarily developed by politicians. It is implemented by educators, but it is developed by the politicians. This is particularly the case in times of economic adversity. The politician must respond to the reality of unemployment, ever-shifting job demands, retarded economic growth. The President says we're a do-nothing Congress, but we try to be a do-something Congress -- and when we try to do something, we focus on those areas of greatest concern to that broadly vocal, newly vocalized group. We try to improve employment possibilities and encourage resource development that corresponds to the demands of the job market.

I was very pleased to note that the College Board is working with the National Institute of Education to develop responsive job-oriented, job-intensive kinds of education, helping to build the bridge, helping to enhance and straighten the linkage.

The focus on vocational education should not, in my opinion, diminish the importance of traditional higher education. There's no reason for it to do that. In an effort to transform equal educational opportunity from vision to reality, Congress increased accessibility of all postsecondary education, including higher education.

Pending legislation expands the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program. If the Congress has its way in terms of the interpretation of Congressional intent of the BEOG, that program will continue to respond to students' financial need.

National legislators have, at least for the time being, avoided, shunned, turned away from the debate over cost effectiveness of educational expenditures. We of the Congress are not unaware of the assertions made by Mr. Justice Powell when he wrote the decision in the Rodriquez case. He said: "Indeed one of the hottest controversies concerns the extent to which there is a demonstrable correlation between educational expenditures and the quality of education...related to this questioned relationship between cost and quality is the equally unsettled controversy as to the proper goals of a system of public education."

Regrettably, public officials have heretofore paid very little attention to the relationship between educational expenditures and the quality of the education received on the other end. Instead, virtually exclusive attention has been paid by us to funding, to power of the purse, to power to appropriate money. The politician articulates a goal of equal quality education -- and tries to reach that goal by increasing the magnitude of authorizations and appropriations. Rarely, very rarely, does the politician follow the education dollar to see whether or not that federal dollar is resulting in the intended impact. Rarely does the politician know whether the end he desired was

achieved. The power to appropriate the federal dollar is the primary vehicle of program impact we have. Fixed in the mind of the public official is that more money equals better education.

It is questionable whether such is the case, and it will continue to be questionable until politicians and educators alike ascertain the correlation between costs and benefits. The current state of the economy, and of the federal treasury, serves to hasten a greatly needed scrutiny and documentation of expenditures vis-a-vis value received. Authorizations, appropriations, must not be thoughtlessly increased nor thoughtlessly decreased.

Proposed authorizations for the National Institute of Education maintain essentially the same levels they have had for the past several years -- 70 million dollars per fiscal year. No increase. No decrease. The same thing. What does this reflect? I fear that it reflects a trend away from research and development programs. Suggested priorities for NIE include student achievement, institutional finance, equal educational opportunity, career preparation, and dissemination of the outcome of research and development -- the outcome, not the start of. A provision in the pending higher education student finance bill would authorize additional funding for a study of education finance alternatives.

The verdict has not yet been rendered on the issue of cost effectiveness. The final judgment on that issue must contain a resolution of the second controversy, as stated by Mr. Justice Powell: the proper goals of a system of public education.

Congress and the courts have been very provincial in their view of the sacred citadels of public education. The defenders of public education view with suspicion and resist any allocation of any part of the public tax dollar to private institutions. The quality of the education received, the quality of the education provided, sometimes falls through the cracks of the debate between public and private institutions. The president of Boston University, John Silber, I think summed up the issue with simplicity. He redefined private institutions by stating: "Since the 'private' institutions are really public in the sense that they constituted for many years almost all of public education (and continue to train and educate a disproportionate number of our nation's trained professionals), we should cease to speak of public and private higher education. We should speak rather of privately sponsored versus taxpayer-sponsored institutions, or of independent as contrasted to state institutions." A Massachusetts educator, Paul Parks, would narrow the issue to the difference between those institutions open to the public and those institutions accountable to the public.

Regardless of your view, the stated goal remains equal educational opportunity. There is room for the addition of only two little words -- "of quality." The public official will not sit quietly and watch this goal of equal quality education frustrated and thwarted by institutional bankruptcies nor anachronistic legal theories. The issue is too important for that.

Public policy and political directions cannot be viewed in a vacuum. To a great extent, unpredictable events, unanticipated events, are bases for the development of public policy. Think about some of the events we have seen and experienced in the past. When the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, there was a sudden technological emphasis. In 1973 there was an Arab oil embargo. What happened? There was great acceleration of coal liquefaction as a process, and gasification, and solar energy technology. The food and fuel shortages added to a burgeoning federal deficit and continue to affect educational funding. Underdeveloped countries with a literacy rate in the teens demand the

exportation of American knowledge and know-how and technique. Policies regarding the future of education must take into account the volatility of domestic and international economies.

The Congress will continue to fund programs that include financial aid based on need. The Congress will continue to support programs such as Talent Search, Upward Bound, special services for the disadvantaged, and programs accessible to veterans. The Congress will view with favor legislation that provides for the upgrading of state incentive grants. Why this? There is the suggestion inherent there that the focus of decision-making ought to be shifted from the federal government to the state level.

It is a given that educational policy will not be left solely to educators. No matter how much you want that, it simply will not happen. The public official's role in policy determination is fixed. Any attempt to exclude the public official from policy decisions will be unsuccessful. Likewise, any attempt to exclude or eliminate the educator will meet with failure. Coexistence between educator and politician is not enough. Coexistence is too tenuous. Detente is not enough. What is enough? Cooperation, mutual respect. Those two ingredients must be the educational fail-safe.
shared -- and I think it is -- surely the means of achievement can be cooperatively forged.

EA 008 543

ED126601

THE SEARCH FOR PURPOSE IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

By R. Freeman Butts
William F. Russell Professor Emeritus in the Foundations of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

In the history of Western education, as well as in the roll of the dice, the number seven keeps turning up. And, incidentally, with a sexist image. Recall that in Proverbs, Wisdom builded her house with seven pillars. In ancient Greece, there were Seven Wise Men. In the later Roman Empire, in the allegory of the wedding of Philology and Mercury, there were seven bridesmaids who became in the Middle Ages the Seven Liberal Arts, the trivium and the quadrivium. In Shakespeare, there were Seven Ages of Man, as some would like it. In the United States we have been somewhat more even-handed: we have matched the Seven Sisters at the college level with the Seven Cardinal Principles at the secondary level, and you all know that most principals are men.

So today I remind you of Seven Historical Purposes that have been proclaimed in American education since the turn of the century when the College Board was founded. They are familiar. They sometimes sound trite and tedious, but they have elicited extraordinary controversy and they continue to do so today. We cannot escape them, and I think we should try to decide how to sort them out in the next 25 years.

Four familiar purposes I call the American quadrivium. They lead in different directions: one leads to academic discipline, one to social efficiency, a third to individual development, and the fourth to vocational competence. None of these roads turns to the left.

The three more recent purposes are, if anything, much more controversial, much more complicated, and I warrant in some respects more fundamental. Education is being called upon to aid in the American people's renewed search for their three most cherished ideals -- liberty, equality, and justice. I call them the new trivium, but they are anything but trivial. Some reactionaries would say they all turn to the left, especially as you can see that they are all revolutionary terms.

The founders of this Republic viewed the Revolution itself and the kind of education needed in the new Republic primarily in political terms, rather than in terms of academic achievement or social class or individual fulfillment or occupational preparation. Over and over again the founders asserted their faith that the welfare of the Republic rested upon an educated citizenry and that the primary purpose of educating the citizenry was to teach the values, the knowledge, and the obligations required of everyone in a democratic society.

As early as the nineteenth century, however, the Revolutionary fervor for education to stress Unum had already begun to give way to the forces of Pluribus. The Revolution's brave and confident civic goals for education by 1900 had become muted and dispersed under the burdens of an exuberant and aggressive modernization process that turned the streams of life from rural to urban centers, from agrarian to industrial processes, from devotion to the public good to aspirations of individual enterprise and economic advancement.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, with which we are primarily concerned here, the curriculum of the schools and colleges had become so

scattered and fragmented that the twin drives of academic discipline and social efficiency created such a clamor that the political purposes of the Revolutionary era were all but forgotten except in Fourth of July orations and commencement speeches.

First a word about the first and most familiar purpose: the call for academic discipline. One of the principal ways in which the academic profession has responded to the influx of new students with a wider range of abilities or interests or aspirations has been to reassert periodically and ever more emphatically the intellectual value of academic training as the prime purpose of secondary and higher education. From the report of the Committee of Ten in 1893 -- whose principal figures incidentally were involved in the founding of the College Board -- through the New Humanism of the early twentieth century to the Great Books and the Council on Basic Education to the new math and the new science of the 1960s, the values of cognitive achievement and intellectual training to be derived from the specialized scholarly disciplines have continued to command the primary loyalties of probably a majority of secondary school teachers and surely the vast majority of college and university teachers.

Second, the call for social efficiency. Arrayed against the academic emphasis in school and college, an increasingly strong and indignant set of voices since the turn of the century has called upon the secondary schools to become more useful for the real everyday life that most youths will have to live, especially the majority who, it was thought, would not go to college. In 1900, the special objects of attack were not only Latin and Greek and the foreign languages in general, but also all the academic subjects that did not directly serve some social purpose. For several decades, the all-embracing term that was coined to counteract arguments for academic discipline was the term "social efficiency."

The primary purpose of education for social efficiency was to prepare the individual for his various roles in society as it actually existed. This often assumed that, since people differ in talents, abilities, interests, and aptitudes, they should be prepared for different social roles for which they are fitted. So the call was for all subjects in the curriculum to justify themselves on the basis of how directly useful they were to the daily life of students in their activities in their homes, in their jobs, office, farm, or in their duties as citizens.

All this led to the argument that students should be classified according to their presumed future and assigned to appropriately differentiated curriculums -- college preparatory, vocational, or general. And this argument assumed that cognitive development was not so important for the majority of students as it was for the fewer college-bound. This view influenced the outlook of the several subject committees of the National Education Association in connection with its Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education, culminating in the publication of the Seven Cardinal Principles in 1918.

Let me remind you of the seven, for they were intended to apply to elementary, secondary, and higher education alike. Their succinctness has made them a reference point for over half a century: health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character. Now, take away the out-of-style adjectives, and we're still talking about these purposes today for all our more sophisticated terminology. Substitute cognitive skills for fundamental processes, career for vocation, family influence for home membership, and the teaching

of values for ethical character, and these are all very much with us. What the Seven Cardinal Principles did was to shift attention in schooling away from preoccupation with academic and intellectual discipline.

Third, the call for individual development. Around the turn of the century a growing chorus of voices called for increasing individual options amidst growing complaints from educators and publicists about the conformity required in the elementary schools of the day. In the early decades, the idea of individual differences, as you very well know, became closely linked with the idea of individual development and received strong support from the psychological testing community, the child development psychologists, and the guidance counseling movement, as well as from the progressive critics of the goals of academic discipline and social efficiency. Recent historical revisionism, however, has begun to question whether the end result of the psychology and testing movements was really to release the child for individual development or whether in reality the testing has led to predicting, sorting, and tracking students according to social class or racial grouping. The argument goes that guidance counselors too often assumed the differences among individuals meant that there must be inequality. If one purpose of schooling and counseling is to help each individual to make the most of his abilities, another purpose must be to help the less able child to adjust to the realities of inequality. This dilemma has not resolved to the present day, as illustrated by the furor over the relation of race and intelligence and the arguments over Jensen, Herrnstein, Shockley, and so on.

The most attention-getting emphasis upon individual development at the secondary level in the 1930s was the Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association, which was more concerned at that time about loosening the iron grasp of college entrance requirements and escaping the grip of the College Board than about problems of caste and class. The study showed that the "progs" did as well as the "trads" in regular college grades and outdid them in personal and social accomplishments. Along came World War II, and the results of the 1930s school study were generally ignored or forgotten in the face of the revival of academic discipline of the 1950s, which took their toll of the idea of individual development. But as educational cycles so often reveal, what was curriculum reform to the 1950s, soon became the uniformity, the conformity, the academic stress, the joylessness of the 1960s. So along came Silberman, Goodman, and Friedenberg, and Illich, and Holt, Kohl, and Kozol, leading the parade of critics to extol again the merits of individual development -- almost as if the prior 50 years had never existed. Free schools, alternative schools, open classrooms became the sesame for escaping the dull routines of the regular classroom, especially as conducted in public schools.

The surge to find new ways to capture the interests and attention of disaffected or bored youth has found expression in the findings of several national commissions in the 1970s, one of which was headed by James S. Coleman. My impression is that the weight of the concern of virtually all those commissions, secondary and higher, has been on the side of the individual's needs and interests rather than on the values to be promoted by education in society. Prominent in all the reports is a stress upon new kinds of work activities, learning through working, career education, and better job placement, which leads me to my fourth purpose -- the call for vocational competence.

On the face of it, what is education for if it is not to prepare youth for a job? This would seem to be a question easy to answer from the point of view

of a young person who wants and needs a job. But direct and immediate preparation for a job did not loom high in the objectives of secondary education for about a hundred years in this Republic. The problem took new form around the turn of the twentieth century as an increasing number of students from nonprofessional and nonmanagerial families began to pour into the secondary schools. The clamor soon arose for the public schools to give vocational education in order to produce a trained labor force for the rapidly industrializing society. This was capped by the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917.

But the issues have not been easy nor simple. There was rivalry between the National Association of Manufacturers, who pressed for specialized and if need be separate institutions of vocational training, and the American Federation of Labor -- which was ever alert to the possibilities that vocational education could become an inferior education designed to keep labor in its place if it were separated into a school or a track different from academic education.

In comparison with European systems that have deliberately and openly separated the schools for the masses from the schools for the classes, the United States has made a radical departure in trying to keep the two together, which some of the European countries are belatedly trying to emulate. But in comparing actual practice with the ideal, many investigators are now charging that we have had in actuality a tracking system that has channeled lower-class children into vocational courses and thus has helped to perpetuate class distinctions in American society. This problem needs a closer and harder look.

At the college and university level, the drive for vocational competence has made enormous headway, not only in the professedly technical institutions but in the professedly liberal arts colleges. The rush to the professions and to the technical specializations has proceeded pell-mell. Interrupted for a time by the downgrading of scientific training and professional training by the youth culture of the 1960s, by common agreement it is now in full flood tide among college students of the present generation, stimulated by unemployment, retrenchment, and declining enrollment. The academic community and the politicians will have to thrash this one out in the face of massive ideological support from Congress, as Representative Barbara Jordan pointed out last night. The answers are not so simple as they once seemed. It sounds very democratic to say that everyone should be trained for the occupation he or she is fitted for, but who is to decide what one is fitted for and who should prepare for what? By tests? By academic prerequisites? By vocational guidance? By degree and credentials?

Whatever the answers are, it turns out that those with the better high school or college preparation get into the "higher" professions and those who don't go to college get into the "lower" vocations. And it also turns out that most of those with the better secondary school or college education are middle- and upper-class whites, while fewer blacks and ethnic minorities get into the higher professional schools and more into the lower-paid vocations. How come? Is differentiation of courses, designed to shape vocational education to appeal to different talents, bound to be undemocratic and class biased? How can it be made to correspond more closely with our ideals of freedom, equality, and justice?

So I come to the new trivium, the three most fundamental purposes of education, purposes that arose with the creation of the Republic itself. I think we now need to press forward harder on these than ever. The varying

claims of liberty, equality, and community have never been easy to solve.

The search for freedom has made education a major arena of conflict in the last 75 years, conflict among the rights claimed for three groups -- parents, teachers, and students -- vis-a-vis the authority of the church, the state, and the school. Following World War I, one of the principal defenses against mushrooming attempts to compel public school attendance was the counter assertion of the rights of parents to guide and direct the education of their children. The landmark case, as we all know, was Pierce vs. Society of Sisters in 1925. The Supreme Court ruled that, under the Fourteenth Amendment's protection of liberty and property under due process of law, the state could certainly regulate all schools and compel attendance at some school (this is even now being questioned), but it could not deprive parents unreasonably of the liberty to send their children to a private or religious school so long as it was not inherently harmful to the child or to the state, and so long as it met reasonable standards set by the state.

Following World War II, the issue of freedom took another turn as religious groups stepped up their drive to gain public funds to assist them in supporting their private schools. This time, the Fourteenth Amendment's protection of liberty for parents ran into the First Amendment's protection of taxpayers in their right to be free from taxation by the state for religious purposes. A landmark case was the Everson case in 1947: "The 'establishment of religion' clause of the First Amendment means at least this: no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

This issue at the higher education level is still very much alive; cases involving state grants to Maryland colleges and state grants for tuition to Tennessee colleges are still on the docket of the Supreme Court.

At the school level, the possible use of vouchers, tuition grants, tax credits, attacks upon compulsory attendance laws, and a whole range of alternatives raise serious questions about the role and authority of public education itself.

Another aspect of education's role in promoting freedom has of course to do with the responsibility of the teaching profession for preserving and extending freedom of thought as a fundamental condition of a free society. The principles of academic freedom for college teachers arose from the aggressive effort by conservative business interests or legislative crusades to stifle the economic and political doctrines emanating from the colleges. Now the schools are belatedly discovering that they, too, have some responsibility for actively promoting the freedom of students and observing the rights of due process in their treatment of children. A campaign for children's rights now promises to take its place alongside the older campaign for parents' rights and teachers' rights. As might be expected, these rights often find themselves in competition and conflict. This is a good time for teachers, administrators, school boards, legislators, parents, and students to undertake together sustained and extensive study of the role of education in protecting and promoting civil liberties throughout our society.

The sixth purpose -- the search for equality. As the search for freedom and education predominated in the 1940s and the 1950s, so the search for equality took the center of the education stage in the 1950s and 1960s. The Constitutional principle is clear. According to the Brown case, "the opportunity of an education....is a right which must be made available on equal terms....Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." Note that

the emphasis in Brown is on equality of educational opportunity and that such opportunity must be on equal terms.

The inequality of access has been the principal object of attack by those who have argued for a common public school system from the founding of the Republic through the common school revival of the nineteenth century to the desegregation, open admission, and affirmative action movements of the twentieth century. I believe the fundamental question has to do with the Constitutional imperatives of equal civil and educational rights, rather than an assumption that a common education will produce equality of academic results or erase the economic differences with which different children begin their schooling. We must not let the main point of equal Constitutional rights be glossed over or blurred by debates among the social scientists about the methodology of Christopher Jencks, or by the uproar in the streets of Boston or Louisville, or by arguments about whether compensatory education has been a failure or a success. The basic question is whether we shall achieve an egalitarian society devoted to equal political and civic rights and what kind of educational structure and program we can devise that will promote that society.

I am struck by how little this question infuses the teaching and learning process in the classroom and on the campuses of thousands of schools and colleges. I believe that too many educators have been too easily diverted by the Jencks emphasis upon what schools can do to reduce differences in cognitive skills or income. More important historically has been the impact of prevailing attitudes, sentiments, and prejudices of white racism, too often perpetuated by the teachers and the schools themselves.

Kenneth Clark put it this way in speaking of the Jencks study: "Unfortunately, nowhere does the Jencks report seriously discuss the educational roles of social sensitivity, respect for justice, and acceptance of differences among human beings."[1] A statement signed by 10 black social scientists and educators made a similar point in criticizing Jencks.[2] James S. Coleman, although commending Jencks for his technical expertise, points to his failure to give attention to the deeper questions of moral philosophy surrounding the existence of inequality in society. Let me emphasize the phrases used by these several critics of Jencks: social sensitivity, respect for justice, group cohesion, community, moral philosophy.[3] These point, to me, to the highest priorities to be grappled with in plotting the future of American education. They lead us from the search for equality to my final point, the search for community.

Fifty years ago, in his 1926 lectures on The Public and Its Problems, John Dewey was especially concerned about the search for conditions under which the Great Society, characterized by aggregated collective action, may become the Great Community based upon a moral communal life that is emotionally, intellectually, and consciously sustained. Dewey found the essence of community to lie in the generic social sense of democracy, nourished by intelligence and education.

Single-minded stress upon liberty ends in dissolution or anarchy. Singular stress on equality leads to mechanical identity or mediocrity. The two must be brought together into a dynamic relationship of community. This concern

1. "Social Policy, Power, and Social Science Research." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 43, No. 1, February 1973, p. 119.

2. Ronald Edwards et al., "A Black Response to Christopher Jenckes' Inequality and Certain Other Issues." Ibid, p. 83.

3. "Equality of Opportunity and Equality of Results." Ibid, p. 137.

and its application to public schooling led to the call for education for democracy that infused the thought of the social frontiersmen and the social reconstructionists from the 1930s to the 1950s. But the search for a community of persuasion as the prime function of schooling went out of style among philosophers of education during the 1950s and 1960s, as it did among academic philosophers themselves.

Now, in recent years, however, the renewed concern for moral and political philosophy has percolated up through academia and even out to public discussion in press and government. John Rawls's book, A Theory of Justice, about which Professor Coleman is going to speak, gained wide attention from 1971 to the present. I simply quote his two principles of justice for institutions. The first principle is that "Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all." The second is that "Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both: (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged...and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity."[4]

One basic problem for education is how to develop a sense of community that will work to achieve and maintain a just society.

The founders' notion of the community upon which public education should be based was the emerging political community. But today we find a pervasive political alienation among almost all social groups in America, marked by the widespread disenchantment with political institutions and politicians. Directly to the point for us as educators are the yawning gaps in political knowledge, a growth of privatism, a decline of patriotism, and a general attitude of political withdrawal among students, especially among the students who are candidates for teaching. All this is punctuated by an indecent lack of exposure to international studies.

I believe that the greatest need for improvement at all levels of education for the next quarter of a century lies in the intensified search for education's role in relating freedom, equality, and community. Of these I believe the very highest priority should be given to the search for a viable, inclusive, and just political community. For me this means a special concern for community of nation above locality, state, and region, and of world above nation. Just how to apply these principles to the knotty educational policies of access, control, support, organization, curriculum, teaching, and research ought to keep us busy enough for the coming year of discussion and planning for the massive turnaround that the whole educational system requires.

In our rhetoric for 200 years we have celebrated civic education for the public good as a basic purpose of elementary and secondary and higher education, and then we have assigned it to ill-prepared high school teachers of history or social studies. At colleges and universities we have assigned it to no one. It virtually drops out of mention even in the rhetoric of higher education.

I would make education for political community the heart of a liberal education, and I would accelerate efforts to focus the civic instruction of schools upon problems of Constitutional rights and civil liberties. After all we have passed through in recent years, I should think we could now face frontally and frankly the proposition that American education does have a

4. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971, pp. 302-303.

positive political role to perform in achieving our historic ideals of political community.

I warrant that such a proposition will be criticized from the right as being an effort to impose a leftist ideology. It will probably be criticized from the left as imposition of middle-class capitalist values, or simply wishy-washy liberalism. And it may be criticized by empirical social scientists on the grounds that schools cannot effect social change -- they simply follow the dictates of society.

But I would argue that if the schools would take seriously the authority of the enduring ideals, sentiments, and moral commitments of our political community as embodied in the Constitutional regime and especially in the Bill of Rights, the schools and colleges could help society to put into practice our professed democratic ideals, and this would, indeed, be a radical social change.

I take hope from the opinion surveys that show that organized education still stands higher in public esteem than do big labor or big business. I certainly believe we should stress in the schools the studies that will stress cultural differences as a basis for ethnic identity and mutual respect. I believe fully in cultural pluralism, but I deem even more important the studies and activities that will cement civic commonality. Cultural pluralism in its best sense reached its peak in times of political cohesion. Remember last year how persons of different backgrounds faced the greatest political crisis of our history. Think of some of the cast of characters: special prosecutors by the name of Cox and Jaworski, a federal judge by the name of Sirica, a Chief Justice by the name of Burger, a House committee chairman by the name of Rodino, and a member of that committee by the name of Jordan, whose memorable words set the goal for all of us: "My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total, and I'm not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution."

If we could bring together the public's faith in education and Barbara Jordan's faith in the Constitution, we could create a pervasive and effective education for political community. But this time I hope we would start with our trivium of purposes and not leave it to the courts, the politicians, the media, or the special interest groups but start where the founders started, with the purposes of education that will achieve the kind of political community we hold most dear.

It took just 16 years for the founders to move from the battlefields of 1775 to the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1791. If they could create a new political regime in 16 years, we ought to be able in a like period to figure out how to educate for the survival and renewal of the American Commonwealth in a world that they could not imagine but we must face.

EA 008 544

ED126602

EQUALITY AND LIBERTY IN EDUCATION

By James S. Coleman
Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago

One issue that has emerged in the 1960s and the 1970s in American society and throughout the world is the issue of inequality. It is an issue that seems likely to be around for some time. It is a challenge of the have-nots to the inequalities enjoyed by the haves. It is an issue that at its most fundamental level engages ideological debate and sets in opposition very deeply held social philosophies, and it is an issue for which the school is very often a battlefield.

The school is a battlefield in part because education has long been regarded as a principal means for providing equality of opportunity. Thus, any inequalities or even ineffectiveness in this institution reduce equality of opportunity, and the outcomes of schooling consist inherently of inequalities -- differential achievement, differential attainment, and differential success. As a consequence, the conception of schooling as providing equality of opportunity is a precarious one indeed.

School is a battlefield in part because the schools are institutions of the state, and as such they are constitutionally required by the Fourteenth Amendment to provide equal protection to all their citizens. If the schools engage in unequal treatment on any grounds but those of educational benefit, they are in violation of the Constitution. The issue, of course, in which this question has been most extensively raised is school desegration.

I would like to examine here the philosophical positions that are deeply and intensely opposed on the issue of equality, to examine some current issues in education within the framework of these philosophies, and to examine the alternatives for education that are contingent on the outcome of this philosophical or ideological struggle.

There have been in recent years broad and frequent challenges on the political front, not merely to specific indefensible inequalities that exist, but to many inequalities that have long been held to be legitimate. Rather than begin with these political issues, however, I would like to begin with philosophy.

Recently two treatises on moral philosophy have been published, each attracting far more attention than is ordinarily given to works in moral or political philosophy. The first is A Theory of Justice by John Rawls,[1] and the second Anarchy, State, and Utopia by Robert Nozick.[2] Rawls's Theory of Justice addresses directly the question: What is a just distribution in society? Or, put differently: Are inequalities justified in society, and if so what kinds and amounts of inequality are justified? Rawls's answer is that only those inequalities are justified which are to the benefit of the least advantaged. Because some inequalities of position or of resources may bring greater productivity and thus greater benefits to all, some inequalities may be justified by this rule, though only such inequalities.

Nozick's book is in part a response to Rawls. He points out that most inequalities are not created by some central authority but arise because of

1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.
2. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

individuals' innate or acquired differences in skills, their differences in capabilities, and their differences in other resources. Nozick argues, I believe correctly, that Rawls's principle assumes that these resources and their products are collectively held, and that individuals have no rights to them -- that is, they have no rights to the fruits of their own labor.

Nozick's theory is diametrically opposed to Rawls's, beginning with an assumption that each person has a set of natural rights. Nozick argues that justice demands not equality nor an inequality that must benefit the least advantaged, but full entitlement by each person to what he justly acquires. Thus, whereas for Rawls a central authority is entitled to distribute the fruits of everyone's labor, for Nozick only the individual is entitled to those fruits, and he has full rights of use and disposal of them. Although these positions as I've stated them are merely the positions of two philosophers, they capture, I think, both the principal basis for regarding equality as the only just distribution and the principal basis for regarding inequalities as justified, with equality as an artificial and imposed state.

The equality position begins with an imagery of the set of benefits held by a central authority and asks the question: How shall these benefits be distributed? Isaiah Berlin, in an article titled "Equality" expresses this position, I think, very well: "No reason need by given for....an equal distribution of benefits -- for that is natural -- self-evidently right and just, and needs no justification....If I have a cake and there are ten persons among whom I wish to divide it, then if I give exactly one-tenth to each, this will not, at any rate automatically, call for justification; whereas if I depart from this principle of equal divisions, I am expected to produce a special reason."[3]

The inequality position begins with a very different imagery, of a set of individuals each having produced through his skills and efforts certain goods. It then asks the question: Who has the right to these goods? The answer to this is as self-evident as is the answer under the central authority imagery as expressed by Isaiah Berlin. Each has the right to the product of his labor until and unless he chooses to transfer some portion of it to another, or perhaps to transfer it to a central authority for redistribution. According to this position, imposition of equality in benefits constitutes a significant loss of rights, not only for the haves but also for the have-nots, for after redistribution those who had been have-nots must be restrained from any market transactions that would destroy the pure equality and reinstate inequality.

Thus, the equality position assumes that a central authority has rights of control over all goods and resources, while the inequality position assumes individuals with rights of control over individually generated goods and resources.

What do these two positions imply for education? Rawls's position, I think, implies erasing all the accidents of birth that give one person more opportunity than another, thereby creating a full equalization of opportunity for each child. As political philosophers have long noted, this equalization implies removing the child from all influences of his family, because families provide differential opportunity, and raising him as a ward of the state, subject to precisely the same opportunity as each other child.

---

3. In Frederick H. Olafson, ed., Justice and Social Policy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1961, p. 131.

Nozick's position implies in contrast no system of public education at all, for public education is redistributive and by Nozick's entitlement principles, each child is entitled to the full untaxed benefits of his family's resources insofar as the family chooses to use those resources for his benefit. Thus, for Nozick all education is private, paid for individually by each family according to its resources and its tastes.

These are extreme positions, those of Rawls and Nozick. Few persons would assent to the educational structure implied by either, and it is clear from the extreme educational structures they imply that neither position can be a correct expression of a just society. For if justice in society requires a Rawlsian solution, then justice must bring also many undesirable consequences in its wake. And if justice in society requires no more than a Nozick solution, then indeed the sins of the fathers are visited on the sons with no outside alleviating influence to mitigate the inheritance of advantage or disadvantage.

Yet these two extreme positions are, I think, useful, because they show the end point toward which either philosophical position points, and they sensitize us to what is gained or lost by moving in either direction. By moving in the Rawls direction of equality we lose individual liberty to a central authority which imposes equality, and by moving in the Nozick direction of individual liberty, we lose equality to the accidents of birth, reinforced by the market and the institution of private property.

The existence of the family is a negation of Rawls's position. The existence of the public school is a negation of Nozick's position. But the balance of power between the family and the school and the balance of power among the forces that control the school reflect a balance in society between these two positions. As the latter balance shifts, there will be a shift in the relative power of family and school and shift in the character of the school itself.

Before examining the principal issues of equality and liberty that have arisen in the schools, it is useful, I think, to examine some general processes that have changed American public education since its inception, processes that, I believe, have implications for these issues.

Public education in America from the outset had two properties. It was locally financed and controlled, and it was egalitarian. Local communities set up, ran, and oversaw their own schools with only slight aid, encouragement, or interference from the state and none from the federal government. Because this country had no remnants of the hierarchical feudal society that in Europe spawned a two-tier public school system, but instead an egalitarian ethic, the public schools were common schools, one school for children from all walks of life. To be sure, there were private schools used by some, particularly in the less egalitarian East, but as the public school movement grew, the single common public school became the overwhelmingly dominant institution in American society. The schools showed some homogeneity because different communities and different neighborhoods had different populations. Yet, in general, the banker's son and the laborer's son went to the same school because their fathers lived and worked in the same community. The dual school system of the South was an aberration, a persistent residue of slavery.

I don't mean to say that the common school was highly egalitarian in practice. The very social diversity of its population led to practices within the school that were designed to preserve the advantages of some and reproduce without too much reshuffling the social structure of the preceding genera-

tion. Yet, the school remained a common school in which children from all social levels mixed, and in the smaller communities of that early period social levels were not as far apart in social style as they are today. If a family was strongly opposed to anything about its child's school but without money for private school, it could move residence to satisfy its educational tastes. Or in some cities with optional attendance zones or city-wide schools it could choose another school without changing residence. But these choices were highly constrained, because limitation in transportation kept residence, workplace, and school physically close.

However, in more recent years and particularly since World War II, several developments have greatly altered the patterns of the early public schools. One is the extreme growth of metropolitan areas and the concomitant decline of the independent small town. For the first time, most American children attended school in a city of some size or a suburb surrounding it. Parallel with this growth was the growth of a remarkably flexible and adaptable transportation system based on the automobile. These two changes, together with a general increase in affluence for all, and thus a greater range of economic options, made possible the separation of workplace from residence, and the development of large socially homogeneous residential areas served by socially homogeneous schools. In principle, the possibilities of choosing a school by choosing residence had not changed, but in practice the possibilities had expanded greatly, as residence anywhere in the metropolitan area became a practical possibility for many persons in many cities. The result was a much greater social homogeneity of the population within each school and an erosion of the egalitarian principle that underlay the common school.

These possibilities coincided with the large-scale movement of blacks to the large cities in the South and particularly in the North. This movement accelerated residential homogenization and the choice of school by choice of residence.

At the same time that these events were taking place, there were more subtle changes in the control and financing of schools. School districts became larger, more of them removed from the effective control of parents in the community. States increased their financing of schools substantially and began to exercise more control over school policy and operations. The federal government began in 1965 for the first time to add to general school finances, and with this financial wedge gained the possibility of some control. At present, over the country as a whole, just about half of school finances are provided by state and federal funds. States provide about 41 percent and the federal government about 9 percent.

Thus, at the same time Northern schools were homogenizing, increasing the separation of social classes and races through residential choice, the localism of school control was giving way to mammoth districts, state exercise of control, and a financial structure appropriate for the exercise of state and federal power.

What had happened was two movements in opposing directions, a movement toward greater local differentiation, greater social homogeneity of individual schools -- and therefore heterogeneity among schools -- and on the other hand a movement away from local finance and control of schools toward increasingly centralized finance and control. The first movement was a movement away from the egalitarian principle of the common school. The second was a movement that placed more power in centralized hands that could attempt to reinstate the egalitarian principle or even to impose new egalitarian principles stronger than the old.

The impasse to which these two movements have led is the impasse that currently confronts schools. There has been an increased exercise of residential choice of school, a right that most persons regard as a natural right in Nozick's sense, and at the same time attempts by government agencies at the district, state, and federal levels, to impose equality of opportunity through restriction or withdrawal of this right.

There are two major issues in education in which this impasse shows itself. One is school finance, and the other is school desegregation. I'll turn to school desegregation first.

The most direct clash of the two principles, that is liberty and equality, has come in the imposition of compulsory busing within school districts. An even more intense clash appears ahead with the possibility of compulsory busing across school district lines within a metropolitan area. I am not discussing here school desegregation that rectifies those segregating actions of school boards and school administrations. But by definition nearly all busing seeks to rectify that school segregation which arises from residential segregation, that is from individual choice. By compulsory busing I mean an assignment by central authority of children to schools at some distance from their home to insure that all schools have similar racial composition.

It should be useful to pause and ask just how the issue of compulsory busing relates to the Rawls and Nozick positions of equality versus liberty. Compulsory busing of children within a jurisdiction involves two ideas: first that different children because of their different backgrounds constitute resources for the learning of other children, and second the assumption by the central authority of the right to redistribute these resources equally among all children. Opposition to compulsory busing accepts the first idea but rejects the assumption by the central authority of the right to carry out such redistribution. This right is regarded by the opponents to be held individually by the parent through his choice of residence. Thus, the advocates of compulsory busing -- whether within the city, within the metropolitan area, or within some differently defined jurisdiction -- hold the premise underlying the arguments for equality, that resources or benefits are under the legitimate control of the central authority, not of individuals. Opponents of busing hold the premise underlying the arguments against equality, that resources or benefits are under the legitimate control of the individuals who generate them, that is the family, or at a later age the children themselves, and not of the central authority.

I think much can be said against both these positions. The first is most obviously and evidently a violation of individual rights as they have existed in this country. The second is, of course, not such a violation but is blind to one fact: the exercise of the same right under reduced constraints -- that is, reduced constraints on contiguity of workplace and home -- can lead to great increases in inequality. Thus, the physical constraints that assured the diversity of the common school in early days no longer exist, and diversity gives way to homogeneity. I believe then that there are two obvious possible alternatives in this situation and a third that is not quite so obvious.

The first is to withdraw the individual rights, to vest them in a central authority that can assign children from different backgrounds in equal measure to all schools. This option attaches total value to equality and is indifferent to any loss of liberty that may obtain.

The second is to retain the individual rights of families and children, the rights of choice of school by choice of residence. This option attaches total

value to individual liberty and is indifferent to whatever inequality may result.

A third less obvious alternative attends both to equality and liberty. Rather than withdrawing rights from those who have the economic power to make them effective, it enlarges the rights of others. It would provide a set of countervailing rights which when exercised would increase equality rather than inequality. This third alternative would be to provide the right to any child in the metropolitan area to transfer and be transported to a school of his choice, as long as the receiving school has a smaller proportion of his race than the school he leaves. Thus, the right to choose school by residence remains, but in addition the right to choose a school even if one is effectively excluded by economics or by race from the residential area it serves is added, a right that when exercised reduces inequality.

Under this alternative neither full equality is realized, nor is the full liberty of the economically advantaged to maintain homogeneous schools realized. Equality is not fully sacrificed for liberty, nor is liberty fully sacrificed for equality, and a new liberty or right is provided for those previously without it. (I should mention in passing that I am not the first to suggest this alternative. In the last Congress, Congressman Richardson Preyer introduced a National Educational Opportunities Act, which affirmed a principle similar to this. He has recently reintroduced it in the present Congress.)

The second arena of impasse between the two movements toward social homogeneity of schools and away from local financing control is equity in school finance. As long as schooling was locally financed from the relatively self-contained economies of independent towns and cities, few problems of equity among school districts arose. As in the Nozick position on individual liberty, each school district was regarded as entitled to its own resources, locally generated and locally held, whatever inequalities may have resulted. But the situation has changed in part to that presupposed by the Rawlsian imagery. Half the school resources are collected by a central authority, the state or federal government, and redistributed to local levels. In such a circumstance, the presuppositions behind the notion of equality in financing are met, at least for half the finances, and Isaiah Berlin's argument for equality and Rawls's argument for equality become persuasive. In this case also the issue of liberty versus equality is a little different: it is not the liberty of individuals but of the local school district to use its own resources freely for its own schools, and it is equality or equity not among individuals but among districts that opposes this district-level liberty.

The issue has arisen in several court cases in which the plaintiffs demanded equal financing by the state or at least financing in which the level of expenditure is made independent of the wealth of the district. The plaintiffs lost in the Supreme Court in one case, but the issue remains in state legislatures and elsewhere.

I think the principle in this case is less in dispute than in the case of school segregation. Individual rights to keep one's own resources for the schooling of one's own children have long ago been voluntarily given up, by votes by the populace to impose taxes for public schooling. So school resources are and have been collected and redistributed from a central authority. The only point at issue is the size of the unit within which equal expenditures are to occur. Is it the local school district, the state, or even the nation as a whole? The last of these is not currently at issue, probably because of the small fraction of school expenditures that are currently federally financed.

The other two levels are where the issue lies. As in school segregation there exist two obvious alternatives, and a third not so obvious.

The first is expanding the equality position to provide full state funding. This alternative forecloses the liberty of individual districts to spend more on education through taxing themselves more heavily, and it does so to insure full equality of financing for all children in the state. (The issue is made more complex by the different costs of education in different localities of the state, but I will ignore these complexities here.) For example, a recent change in state funding by the New Jersey legislature to provide a thorough and efficient education for all children imposes a ceiling on the district's expenditures.

The second alternative is maintaining the position of liberty for local communities by maintaining local taxation and local decision-making about the level of expenditure. State supplementation would occur as it does at present, but with no attempt to constrain the expenditures of local districts in the name of equality. This position ignores, except in a secondary way through state supplementation, the principle of equality throughout the state, in order to preserve the liberty of individual districts to use their taxes as they see fit for education.

A third less obvious alternative is one that neither maintains the full liberty of the second alternative nor wholly discards it in favor of equity as in the first alternative. Under this alternative each district determines the level of expenditure for education it desires, and thus its own rate of taxation. But the taxable wealth is in effect equalized throughout the state, so that two districts that vote the same tax rate will raise the same educational revenues, though one district may contain little taxable property and the other much. (I should mention again that this proposal also has been made by others, and I merely restate it here.[4]) This alternative, like the third alternative in the issue of school desegregation, does not achieve full equality but neither does it sacrifice full liberty. It gives each district in effect the same wealth and then allows the district the liberty of determining its tax rate for education.

This extended examination of the issue of equality or inequality in education has, of course, resolved no problems. What I wanted to do, however, this morning was to show how certain general movements in society are directly affecting policies in education and to indicate how alternative policies address these general social movements.

4. John Coons, William Clune, and Stephen Sugarman, Private Wealth and Public Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1970.

EA 008 545

ED126603

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION

By David Mathews
United States Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

I have seen or at least heard of forced marches before. This is the first time I have ever attended a forced luncheon where you ate to cadence, but I do have a tight schedule and you have eaten in a way that has allowed me to make that schedule and I want to thank you for it.

I have been using these opportunities to talk with fellow educators as a way to work out ideas that are very much in the formative stages and to speculate a bit. This particular setting intimidates speculation, but I really want to do only two things: make some comments on what you are doing and what from my perspective you might give some particular priority in your work; and elaborate on a notion that I've been trying to sell, not overly successfully, in the last few weeks. This notion is that, as an educational community, we need to put more emphasis on broad questions of purpose. I don't mean that we need to reinvent the wheel. But even though questions of purpose have been addressed before, they have specific relationships to the contemporary dilemmas in which we find ourselves.

But first I want to talk about the College Board's purposes. It's a great thrill in the job I have to tell somebody else what to do, and I trust and hope you will indulge me in that. There are three programs that you are beginning to move into that I think have exceptional promise.

First, you have recently given attention to a range of performance evaluations whose purpose is to allow people either to enter college, which they might not otherwise have done, or to gain credit for learning that they have already acquired so that they might enjoy a more advanced status and thus take better advantage of the programs of the institution.

I think that this kind of work deserves every attention you can give it. It is a key to a more progressive future for higher education, and I think that if you will expand performance evaluation to the new populations that need to be served, you'll find a very productive line of research and work.

For example, if it is true that institutions of higher education are going to have to serve adults more, it may be that there are some variations on what you now do in performance evaluation that will speak to the very special problems of the adult. They after all come with far more experience than the 18- to 22-year-olds who normally take these examinations.

There is a second line of work and inquiry that I would suggest as being appropriate for an organization with your experience and skills. We are learning that we must provide more field experience for college students for a number of reasons, one being that college students today have a limited experience with the world of work. This is hardly the age when you go out and work with your father in his shop or plow in the field and get some sense of the world of work from direct experience. Our kind of society and complex economy militate against that experience, so college students probably have less of that sort of background than they should.

I think we are learning that there are many fields in which you must learn as you practice in order to learn properly. We've always felt that to be true in medicine and teaching, but I think we're learning that it's equally true in a lot of other professions. Perhaps it used to be thought that in

order to be academically respectable one should ignore practice. But I think the situation today demands more attention to field experience.

The difficulty is that if experience in and of itself is equatable with education, we've wasted a lot of people's money for a long time. There has to be some difference between pure experience and education. That difference is properly in the amount of theoretical understanding that one gains. It is the ability to form general principles and concepts that allows people to see through experience to some finer reality and thus to use experience in a more productive way.

There is growing acceptance of field experience on the college campus -- independent study, internships of one kind or another. But we have yet to cross the bridge between theoretical learning and field experience. It is for that reason that the academic community is a bit suspicious, and I think properly so.

It occurs to me that with your background in testing for performance, you could help the community of education to validate in several ways this field experience by testing for theoretical understandings before and after. More than that, you may use that testing as a device for bringing more theoretical exposure, more attention to the necessity for developing generalizations and broad views. If testing could do that, you will have served the community of higher education right now in a very useful way.

Third, you are beginning to deal with the relationship between college education and job placement -- the worlds of work and the worlds of education. You are already, I understand, doing a good deal of work with career counseling and job placement and have some interest there. The gap between the world of work and the world of education is critical, and if you can be of some assistance in bringing those two worlds closer together -- either through what you do in testing programs or what you do to aid the work experience -- you will have made a valuable contribution.

The second part of what I have to say today deals with the obligations, not just of this particular organization, but of the community of education to society itself. We flatter ourselves when we think that we gather together in these meetings and set great purposes for education and that society then adopts our program and marches to our tune. There is regrettably very little evidence in the history of higher education to suggest that that is true. As a matter of fact, the evidence is that just the contrary happens -- that education is a responsive institution and that the educational community is best when it is creatively responsive to the broad demands of society.

That's why I've been making the argument that we ought to devote a certain percentage of our time -- preferably by some method other than regulation -- to the broad purposes and dilemmas of society and to fathoming the relationship of education to those dilemmas. Let me suggest one such example that has to do with education in the spirit of the times.

When I've played around with this on kind and indulging audiences long enough, it will become a speech entitled "Education in the Spirit of the Times." It's not that now. But such as it is so far here it is.

If you look at the dominant themes of 1975, if you look at the recent poll in The New York Times, if you look at the two polls on the American people, in Time and I think Newsweek about a month ago, it's pretty clear that there is a national dilemma of the spirit. The American people are unhappy, they are frustrated, they despair. They are very uncertain about their present situation and more uncertain about their future.

Maybe there is in our personal and national experience an end to a great

many of our cherished illusions -- an end of frontiers of all sorts -- and perhaps that dilemma is having the same effect on our spirit that the end of the frontier had on the physical exploration of the continent. I have said in some other remarks, I hope not unkindly, that if this age is remembered at all it will perhaps be remembered as an age when things didn't work out the way we thought they would.

But if you examine this phenomenon a bit more closely, the truth of the matter seems to be that the facts of our existence and the projections for our future are not in themselves despairing. The despair, the things that are reported in the polls, stem from the way that we choose to look at the future, and I think we have to be candid enough with ourselves to say that those are our choices.

We didn't just invent uncertainty in 1975, or even discover circumstances that warranted it. If you look at our country's history, if you look at the things that we've been up against and the uncertainty we have had to deal with, we've had plenty of uncertainty before.

This all suggests to me that the dilemma is not so much in the fact of our situation. The crisis is in the human spirit. In a lot of ways, what we are doing with our analysis of the situation is passing a judgment on ourselves. I do not minimize such problems as the economy or the energy crisis. They are real. But I am addressing what I think is another crisis, which is less apparent.

The only antidote for uncertainty that's ever been found is in perspective. And perspective, I suggest, is at the very heart of the business of the community of higher education, whether it is expressed in the institution that sent you here or the organization that calls you together for this particular meeting.

Robert Frost said that the essential task of education is to learn to live with complexity without losing one's temper or one's self confidence. If you paraphrase what he had to say, the task of education is learning to live with complexity, and hence frustration, and hence uncertainty without losing control of the circumstances about us.

I started to conclude these remarks with the bromide that uncertainty is both the zest of the explorer and the fear of the entrapped. It all depends on your perspective. But I have decided that bromides do an injustice to the seriousness of the dilemma we are in, and I want to say nothing to suggest that the problems of the economy, or the energy crisis, or foreign affairs, or domestic affairs are not real. I want to go beyond that to point out a dilemma that I think you and I have a peculiar and special responsibility for.

It seems to me that the lesson here is that education is inherently individualistic and humanistic, that it concerns itself in its ultimate with the individual and with both the intellectual and spiritual qualities of that individual. As a matter of fact, I would point out that all social reform, all progressive thrust in our society until fairly recently is based, if it has any legitimate base, in the perfection of the individual.

It seems to me that with all the programs sponsored by the College Board, even with your special focus on entrance examinations of various kinds, and even given the highly specialized and sophisticated detail of that work, you cannot forget, any more than I can forget, that we are part of the educational community and that we have an inescapable obligation to address the issues of spirit and purpose in our time.

EA 008 546

EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT: NEW CHALLENGES FOR SCHOOL AND COLLEGE LEADERS

By Maurice B. Mitchell
Chancellor, University of Denver

ED126604

Like most educators, especially university administrators, who stand up in front of large crowds in these most incessant series of dialogues we conduct, I keep wondering whether there's going to be some magic moment when, like natural gas, the energy will disappear, we will have heard all we can stand listening to, and the great American custom of conferences will come to a close. It's interesting to think about. The business of talking has become so widespread that there now is a cult that believes that plants will be happier if you talk to them. I know one secretary who keeps talking to a potted plant in her office. I hear her murmuring to it all day long, and not long ago when she left for lunch I went up to the plant and I said, "How do you stand it?" The plant said, "Who listens?" I found that a very sobering thing to think about.

You've asked me to talk about some of the problems of educational management. When you're talking about the educational problems of today and the educational system of tomorrow, asking yourself whom the system is going to be for and why it will serve the constituencies it does, remember that we have just come through the era of good times, never thinking much about tomorrow. Like the French waiter, it never was going to come. Now we are learning that, in the words of Paul Valery, the future isn't what it used to be, and we're going to have to re-examine what we think about tomorrow. I'm going to try to do that today from the point of view of educational management.

It's hard to define the educational management. It depends on where you sit. When things go very well, for example, my trustees all share in educational management. When they don't go very well I'm somehow alone as an educational manager. My trustees, like most boards of trustees, tend to view Herbert Hoover as a dangerous radical and often think in those terms about what goes on on the campus. I remember the days when we used to be denounced, all of us in educational management, when it was conventional wisdom that we couldn't handle student unrest. We were incompetent, indecisive, flabby, and had no real understanding of the problems of how to deal with unruly people, and couldn't face up to tough business decisions. I stand here in the impoverished city of my birth, thinking back about the Penn Central, the Franklin Bank, Lockheed, and Rolls Royce, and conclude that for all of us in management there are good times and bad times. It is useful to speculate on the nature of our assignments, and then to talk about what we can do about producing a better environment for the professional field in which we live.

It's good for us also to have made mistakes and to be blamed for making mistakes. Our businessmen missed the opportunity to build New York as a great fiscally sound city and figured Penn Central all wrong, and the Franklin Bank was inexcusably at fault for the expedition it launched into foreign currencies. But we educational managers have had our administrative errors, too. We misguessed the population trends, we never really got a proper handle on where funding was going to come from for some of our dreams. No one ever really thought far enough ahead to deal with the changing relationship between our school systems and our teachers. We have never really dealt with the shift to the suburbs the way we could have, given the facts available to us. We've never really come face to face with the problems of desegregating school systems and desegregating society. We underestimated the implications of infla-

tion, and although we knew it and saw it back in 1957 and again when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed, we never really learned to play the game of educational politics.

I guess, like many people in good times, we thought it would always be this way, and of course it couldn't last. Now everything is upon us at the same time. In September of this year one could watch the American educational scene and see the teachers on strike, the angry faces of people flinging rocks through buses and spitting on children, the political turmoil that grew out of those episodes, the desperation economics of educational institutions at all levels, and realize that we have problems today that are unprecedented in our time, and that we have problems ahead of us on a scale that some of us have never dealt with before. The present and future concerns of educational management lie in the areas I have just mentioned.

When I came to the University of Denver in 1967, the first two items on the American agenda were education and civil rights. They had emerged when our country came out of World War II and was convinced that the kind of education we had been administering before World War II was no longer adequate. Many of us had wartime experience with new teaching techniques, new technologies. We learned in a great haste, under very different circumstances. We knew that in the world of the nuclear phenomena there would be instruments and techniques and systems we had never seen before. We knew they and more like them were here to stay. We knew we had to produce for our children a different kind of learning than we had had ourselves. So our society made a major commitment to modernize its educational system. What we found when we began the task was that the system was undersized, and underbuilt; that we didn't have the schoolhouses, we didn't have the teachers, we didn't have the plans, we really didn't know where this modern system was supposed to take us, or how it was to function. Solving those problems became a number one item on the American agenda. We had finished a war, we were seeking a national purpose, and we found it there, in our schools.

We found national purpose too in the plight of the people who were living in the dark corners of our society, people in poverty, people whose racial characteristics or ethnic background was different, people who had never been allowed to participate in the system we had built in this country, and people who were now seeking to be heard, pleading for equal opportunity -- the equal opportunity we had fought for and the equal opportunity we were entitled to under the terms of the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, and all of the many amendments and laws that have piled up since then.

We will remember those days vividly, those of us who have observed them at close range, as long as we live.

I remind you now that neither of these national goals is high on the agenda now before the American public. If you stop people on the streets, you will discover that the education profession in which we are engaged is at least twentieth on their list of priorities. As one who has spent some time in the civil rights field, I can tell you that's where civil rights are, too. If you scratch the American passerby and try to find out what interests him most today he will tell you that he is concerned about inflation, about unemployment, about how much longer he's going to be able to turn on his natural gas-fired furnace, when the new energy resources are going to be available, how he can plan a new factory and get the energy to operate it, what is the future of our environment, and whether he should continue to use shaving cream that comes in a Freon-pressurized spray can. Before we get him to talk about improving education and dealing with civil rights, you must listen to a new list of personal

concerns. Taxpayers are tired of issues and tired of expense and have begun to build up a callous indifference or knee-jerk responses of bitterness and resentment. We aren't just an exhausted society and a sad society, we are a society that's beginning to have active negative views of things we used to have active positive views about. I think that fact has to be viewed realistically by educational administrators.

Things like the disaster of New York City inevitably affect people all over the country. We talk in Denver about whether our city is going to go broke (if Denver goes broke it will represent one day's interest payment in New York -- so you have to see things in a relative way). But when a city like Denver thinks it's going to go broke, what do you think is the first thing it does? It cancels the budget for school crossing guards. Now, who would have guessed 20 years ago that at the first sign of a fiscal crisis they'd reach out and take people who help little children across the streets on the way to school and stop hiring them. Of course who would have thought that you would have to pay a school crossing guard. My mother used to get out there with a club and a stop sign. She was a dollar-a-year woman!

The State of Colorado has already advised Colorado State University to take a 1.1 million dollar budget cut, unprecedented and unexpected and unplanned. When times get bad educational administrators begin to hear very quickly the sounds of their communities rethinking educational values in a dollars and cents sense. We are going to have to re-examine the manner in which we have justified the economics we are practicing throughout our institutions. Our communities are going to ask us once again to re-examine what we are providing and we will want to ask whether or not we have communicated effectively to them what services we are providing. We are expected, of course, to desegregate the schools, and we should, indeed we must. We are expected to have expensive affirmative action programs in our school systems, in our universities. We are expected to provide a range of services that were unthinkable when I was a student in the city schools of New York. But they are not usually talked about as added factors of cost. Somehow they sneaked in as a part of the "basic costs" of education.

I remember going to New York University here in New York for awhile. If you fell down a flight of stairs and broke your leg in those days, they handed you a bandaid and a slip of paper containing the address of the nearest hospital, and wished you well. If you fall down a flight of stairs at the University of Denver, when you hit bottom you are treated to an incredible array of services -- guidance, medical, psychiatric, security, lawyers.

When I was a youngster they expected your home to teach you to behave and your church to give you some sense of moral values. You went to school to learn something. But I've met many a superintendent over the years who has said to me, "Parents come in here and say, 'Never mind teaching him to read and write! Just teach him to behave. I'll teach him to read and write!'" Well, parents aren't much better at that than we are, if I am seeing the results correctly.

We're seeing city schools a little bit emptier year after year. Buildings we built in the postwar years when it was assumed that those buildings would be full forever are now operating half empty. I visited a school in the last couple of months in Denver where a new four-classroom wing was being occupied by 20 children, five in each classroom, children who were getting special education. Special education was a unique word in the days when I went to school here in New York, and we've provided a great deal of it. It's inspiring to see and provocative to watch -- and by the way challenging to teach young

teachers for. But five children in the corner of a classroom built for 30, with audiovisual aids built into the walls and all of the modern appurtenances of an expensive new classroom...four empty classrooms like that make one wonder what the economics of tomorrow's education will turn out to be and what kinds of solutions we're going to bring to bear on problems like that.

Meanwhile, in the nearby suburbs they are building brand new schools like that, issuing new bonds, raising new taxes for people who have no relationship to them, who have fled the city to get away from the sprawl and the evil and the agony they think lives in the city -- and also to get away from the minority community. They now live on the other side of the white noose around our great cities, spending as if money would last forever and incurring debts to be charged against education for generations to come.

No one in education at any level, since I have been involved in the system, has ever confronted the business of adequately compensating teachers. And no one can look at this challenge for university and public school administrators and special school administrators honestly without saying to himself that sooner or later that day of reckoning will also come. You can't live in a world of runaway inflation and exploit the dedication of teachers and the dedication of school officials and school employees indefinitely.

I'm responsible in the end for managing the budget for the University of Denver, which by the way is 40 million dollars a year, the same I understand as the College Entrance Examination Board's. In both cases we are spending half of what we should be for what we are doing. Decisions about the economics of education are made by educational administrators. They are made by responsible officials. They are made in the form of the budget, which is the financial statement of the purposes of the institution and its expectations. Those of us who do the budgeting reflect the problems of management when we ask ourselves whether we are producing budgets that accurately reflect our needs, whether we are enshrining mediocrity and inefficiency and unnecessary expense, whether we are depriving generations of children of opportunities to do things in different ways, with new systems, and new technology, whether we are giving the public a chance to find out what things cost in the educational system and why we think they are worth what we say they are.

I end my discussion of management's role in educational economics by saying that educational administration's major and first challenge is to reflect the true cost of the educational system in terms of the expectations of our public and in terms of what we know to be the costs of achieving them. Anything less than that, anything that is politically oriented, anything that we are bluffed out of, anything that we grit our teeth and do knowing that we shouldn't -- these don't give the American society a chance to do what I happen to think it can do and will do, which is pay for what its real needs are in the field of education.

The second area of administrative challenge and opportunity is social change. It is an expensive and deeply troubling area, and we again can view it as one of the great challenges to confront our educational system. We don't have, in this country, a very useful theory for engaging in social change. If you stop to think about it, we are technologically oriented and we take only technology on faith. Thus, if I go to the airport today and I walk out to the airplane and the girl hands me a carnation and says, "Congratulations, you are flying on the new DC-267 1/2, it only has one wing" -- do you think I'm going to get off? I'm going to sit right down and smile. If I go to the doctor and he says he has a new shot for me I put my arm out. I don't know what it is, and even if I asked him I wouldn't know after he told me. I get in the eleva-

tor and never say "Is the cable tied?" Yet, let someone come along with a social change and I've got 500 researchers out there -- do you learn more or don't you if you are in this condition or that posture, going to school with this color child or that color child?

Why are we so suspicious of reasonable, logical and intelligent-sounding change in our society when we are so yielding to technology? I don't know, but these suspicions show up in what we are doing in our school systems today. We are desegrating our schools. That is a major social change and a major administrative and management challenge. The school board in Denver has appealed every decision that the federal courts have made urging that we desegrate. The superintendent of schools has taken the position that he doesn't agree with the court order, wouldn't have written it that way, and will cooperate but dislikes the whole idea. How much more expensive is that kind of change going to be because of his attitude, and what is the administrative responsibility in desegration situations like that? What is the responsibility of the President of the United States when the courts have ordered busing as a vehicle for change and he says "I'm against busing"? If you want an administrative problem to struggle with, there is one we will have living with us for a long time to come. I've lived under two presidents who have said to the American people with a leer "This sacrifice you may be making with your children isn't worth it" -- and neither has said "But here is the alternative."

Surely, no one in this room any longer believes that we can vacuum out the suburbs and paint them over, or paint over the slums in the inner part of our cities, jack up the quality of education, and hustle all the ethnic minorities back down where, it would appear, many people think they naturally belong. Yet anyone listening to our political leaders might think so. Educational management, which never was designed to take care of that kind of social change, which is the responsibility of our entire nation, is going to be involved in these kinds of social changes for years to come.

As administrators we are also dealing with a wave of anti-intellectualism. We are going through a period when the very value of any education is being challenged. It is not uncommon to see an editorial in a local paper that says "We have enough college educated people. What we need is people who can fix our television sets, repair our cars." But the people who write the editorials are always worried about their kids' SAT scores, and they are often in our admissions offices seeking special consideration. What they want is for <u>your</u> children to fix their cars and repair their television sets. We have made very feeble responses to that attitude. It is a problem for every educational administrator because he provides the leadership in his system and his community that must respond to that kind of short-sighted view of the function of the educational system.

The alternative most frequently suggested by the anti-intellectuals, of course, is vocationalism -- everybody gets trained for the job, everybody learns how to do something. I started in journalism, and I went from there to broadcasting. I left broadcasting to go to industrial music. I made educational motion pictures. I was a printer. I was a publisher. I ran a reference company. I'm running a university. What's the category of the vocational school I should have gone to?

New standards of behavior trouble us and cause administrative problems of the gravest sort. How does one redesign disciplinary standards or management systems for new kinds of disciplinary infractions, for kinds of behavior unprecedented in our society? There is no school master here today and no school superintendent and certainly no university or college president who

has not brooded about the proper response to kinds of behavior that simply were never seen before.

Now, too, there is an incredible array of expectations tossed at all of us. We are a split-purpose institution now. We started by teaching youngsters to read and write and figure, we taught them about the areas of the world, we helped them move into those areas of study where they could understand the environment around them and where they thought about the responsibilities of citizenship. Then we introduced them to the great traditions, the culture that had been handed down to us in the past, taught them how to think about the problems of the present, to study them in the presence of scholars. That is a pretty good profile of what the educational system was up to. What else are we up to now? We have to prepare kids for jobs the minute they leave school. We are supposed to prepare them to go to college. We are supposed to prepare them or find a way to identify those who should go to four-year colleges and those who should go to junior colleges and those who are supposed to be assigned to vocational schools. We are supposed to find a way to educate senior citizens -- the euphemism for "old people" -- and women who, having discovered that a new era is dawning, want to come back and have a second chance at building life for themselves. And this is all supposed to happen within the framework of the single-purpose institutions we were originally designed to be. The problem is terribly difficult from a management point of view, and the economics are shattering.

The ultimate problem is what can you really do, and what can you say you are doing, and how can you deal with that difference. Is it true that college-educated senior citizens should go back to college? How important is that experience to them, and what happens to the class of undergraduates who study with them? What problems are there for faculty and what problems are there for the institution? What do you do about the theory that all alumni should come back to their old school for nothing since they once paid $200 a year tuition? What do you do with an elderly alumnus who sits in a history class and talks so much that nobody else can get a word in? There is an enormous array of problems growing out of this split assignment we all have. And there are problems for the administrators that never appear on the surface.

I used to go to a lot of state and national conferences of school superintendents. Every once in a while a face would drop out of a group, and you would say "What happened to him?" and someone would say, "Well, he built a new high school." That's how you lost your job in those days. The auditorium was always too big or too small or the cafeteria was in the wrong place or the wrong contractor got the job -- and off you went to be superintendent somewhere else. What are today's casualties going to come from? I suspect some of them will come from the bitterness and anger of school desegregation and from the sheer exhaustion that administering that kind of a school system creates within one. We hear that administrative jobs are harder to fill. As an old businessman who thought he had worked very hard before he went to the university, I can only say I am working three times as hard as I ever did. The mechanism is entirely different. When I ran a business organization that had 14,500 employees, I could push a button on my desk and somewhere in that system a light went on and somebody performed. I have a button on my desk now, and if I push it, it falls in the hole. As a matter of fact on some occasions a needle comes back out and jabs my finger.

School administrators are living in a society that has changed very quickly, that appears to be continuing to change quickly. They are dealing with searing problems like desegregating the public schools and operating massive trans-

portation systems and all kinds of new challenges in teacher in-service training and human relations, in the preparation for unknown circumstances. In a strange kind of a way they are often doing this without public support, with nothing but the support and the instructions of the courts. The legislature of the State of Colorado passed a resolution last year right in the face of school desegregation, advising Congress that it should pass a law saying that you could not bus anybody to school. That's a progressive thing to do! And in the middle of everything, the President said he didn't believe in it either. What we are asking school administrators to do is take personal responsibility for social change, or to administer it in some sort of sane, responsible way despite the scorn of our public leaders. That's true, by the way, about every aspect of the schools.

A third major source of problems for administrators is the establishment of standards. As a parent and university administrator, as a private citizen, I view with deep concern what seems to be happening to standards. I know this is a sensitive subject, and I point no fingers at anyone, but I'm troubled by what I see about the writing ability of students in college. I'm troubled by the adjustments administrators seem to be making so that everyone can be happy and successful. I'm troubled at the response to the demand for instant success. I think the day is almost upon us when we're going to pay the price of all this. We are changing the system of education in this country, with results we have yet to understand. This generation will be gone before we measure the results.

I sat in a conference the other day with Clare Luce and Clifton Fadiman and Mortimer Adler and Sir Walter Perry of the Open University. We were talking about life in the twenty-first century. Fadiman made the point that it's a gray, gloomy, dreary prospect. We have degraded cultural standards, we have cherished mediocrity, we have praised incompetence. Our music and our art and our literature are junk that we applaud. We have accepted from the media disgracefully low levels of performance, and we're going to accept worse as time goes on. Instead of watching television for six hours a day, we're going to watch it for 12. We are brainwashing our children to accept trash as having value, and to be delighted when they receive counterfeit instead of real value. That gets back to our standards.

I remember that everyone suddenly discovered that their children must go to college -- and not only to college but to Harvard. When I went to high school the college-bound student was the exception. The high school I went to here in New York City, DeWitt Clinton, was a terminal experience. (It practically was a terminal experience physically!) That high school trained young men -- there were no women in it -- to go on out and get a job, get to work. It didn't expect them to go on to college. Only a few of us took the Regents exams, which in effect have us college entrance diplomas.

But high school has changed. I was on the school board at New Trier, (often called the world's greatest high school and identified as that by the leading rating organization: the local real estate agent). The pressures and the life in New Trier were fascinating. New Trier was really not a high school, it was a prep school. People in Winnetka just didn't want to bother sending everybody away to prep school, so they turned their elementary and secondary system into private schools. They spent more money per student on them than even most private schools have been able to spend. They had lavish facilities. As a matter of fact, when the main school got a little bit crowded, we raised $12 million to build a new school for 2,500 students. By the way, now a little more than 10 years later that new school is believed super-

fluous. The population trends we were looking at didn't survive the facts of life styles and birth rates. That reflects on our ability to forecast properly and to make judgments, to use data properly as administrators, which I will get to shortly.

New Trier's problem was to get everybody into college, and 96 percent of its students went to college. I watched the madness of that day. We had in some study areas as many as five tracks a student could go on. Parents would come in and say "Get my son off the A track," which was the high performance track. "Why?" "Because the best he can do in that kind of competition is a B and I want him to get into a good college, so move him down where he can get an A." That wasn't uncommon. I've been in secondary schools where the adjustments were far more extreme than that. We have seen students arriving at the university shrouded in letters of recommendation, who barely have the fundamental communication skills.

We had a good example earlier this year. A former United States Senator wrote me a glowing letter about a remarkable young man whose father had been an ambassador and who deserved admission to our school. I sent the glowing letter, along with another one I got from the president of a great corporation, with much satisfaction to our admissions office. They wrote back to me and said, "This kid has been thrown out of two schools already; the last one he tried to burn down. His grades never were any good in the first place. No wonder he needed those heavy recommendations." I wrote back to all my friends and asked them if they realized what they were doing. They both wrote back to me and apologized. Meanwhile, I got a letter from the admissions office saying "Well, it's just because it's you we let him in." I'm afraid to ask how he's doing. I have an uneasy feeling that he will make Phi Beta Kappa, for reasons I hate to think about.

I think we are inflating and degrading the standards we built over long years, that we are letting those standards and traditions go by the board. We're substituting expedience for performance. We talk a great deal about accountability, and we use it on our colleagues. But we don't really yield to it ourselves, and if we as administrators don't preserve the standards of the American educational system, there won't be any system. It will be just a system and not a foundation on which this nation can hope to grow and to build an educated citizenry that can deal with its problems.

My daughter goes to a university where the lowest grade is a C. You can't get a D or an F. The school average is very high, which is not hard to understand. I think that's disgraceful. If you don't want to have grades, don't have grades, but don't have just good grades. Don't have only "smart people," even if they can't read and write and figure. There are dangers here. The danger for one that our junior college system may end up as an educational slum. I think standards are the third great educational problem for the administrator.

And, of course, the fourth great problem is planning. Here we are with the birth rate going down. We probably should have said to ourselves in some great conference the day the pill was universally distributed, "What's going to be the outcome of this? How can everybody gobble pills and expect the population trends to continue?" I arrived right in the middle of the pill period, and there was a chart on my desk that said the University of Denver was going to grow from the then 8,000 to 17,000 long before this. We are now at 7,700. Something did that, and something is going to do it in a much more precise and persistent and damaging way in the 1980s. It's all very well to joke about the pill and zero population growth, which may indeed be the best way this

country can go from an ecological standpoint. But you don't build new buildings for zero population growth.

So far I've said that this is a trying period for educational management and administration. The worst features of this period are the uncertainty of where funds are coming from and the prevailing black economic mood that sweeps across the country, and the fact that what used to be a service that society demanded has become a service far down on the list of social demands and felt needs. Since the operation of educational institutions is expressed in budgets, which are the expression of policy in fiscal terms, there is a great challenge for administrators to rethink the budgeting process and the cost of what they're doing and what has to be done.

We have a bad habit in education of planning from one appropriations year to the next. We never give the public a chance to see what a 20-year run is going to be like and what we really need. We budget from a meeting of the city council to a meeting of the city council, from a meeting of the state legislature to a meeting of the state legislature. From enrollment income of one year to enrollment income of another year. It's ridiculous and shortsighted. No business can function that way. We have a responsibility there, and a challenge goes with it.

The second problem we educational managers have is that society is changing. We've got to find some way to indicate to society that if change is going to take place in the educational system, society has to be sympathetic and understanding to that system. We cannot simply sit in the high councils and denounce what is going on in the public school system. Nor can the federal or state agencies ask us to deal with social change without recognizing its cost and providing for it. We suffer grievously from social burdens brought about by often meaningless regulations and publicity-inspired demands on our time and our payroll funds.

You'll never get social change to mean anything if you don't offer something in return. Why should I send my child on a bus? Because the experience is important and rich, and you can see it when you go and look at it. Why should I change and rearrange the university, change the undergraduate and graduate patterns? Because there is a rational explanation for it, you can see it and feel it when you participate in it.

Third, we have standards in the breach. What's the value of a diploma? What's the value of a credential? You know, in Colorado we have universities in strange places creeping into the state from all over the country, saying to teachers, "Show up five Saturdays, pay the fees in advance, no homework, no papers to write, no examinations. Just bring the body and pay the fees and we'll give you a certificate from an accredited institution that says you have taken a professional course. You can turn that in and get a raise." And, by the way, these are accredited institutions that do this. What do the standards of accreditation mean? What are our standards of acceptance? How do we propose to provide administrative leadership for establishing standards? One thing we must learn is to say no. Many have lost that ability.

Finally, we have to do a better job of planning. We have to know where we're going and share that information with our colleagues, with our profession, with the federal agencies, with those who provide funds for us, and those who look to us for service. If we aren't able to do what's being demanded we ought to say so, and if we are we ought to make clear how we're going to do it. My daughter-this year gave me a copy of Carl Becker's The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers which I read with respect for the second time. I was again reminded of what we must avoid here

in higher education. In the story the philosophers -- who thought of the early days of civilization as riddled with superstition and fear and senseless acts -- built what they thought was a heavenly city in a new world. But it turned out that they had just rebuilt the old world in new terms; nothing had changed.

We talk a lot about change. We talk a lot about building. We come to meetings like this and talk about what the future is going to be like and why and for whom. The great danger is that we'll make another future just like the one we've gotten rid of and have to live the past all over again. Let us as managers agree that if we do nothing else right at least we'll make sure we don't have to live the past over again.

EA 008 547

ED126605

EDUCATION IN A CHANGING ECONOMY

By Ralph P. Davidson
Publisher, Time

I must confess to you that I approach today's speech with a certain amount of trepidation for fear that in the audience there might be a former professor of mine from Stanford who would rise to his feet and say, "My God, what is he doing talking about higher education?" However, here I am, and I'll see if I can define my subject for you and spend a few minutes with you today talking about some ideas and thoughts I have on the general subject.

I was asked to have my presentation reflect some of the economic and business directions of the nation that will affect the future of the educational system, and perhaps provide some of my own perspectives on how education can better communicate and serve the needs of the nation.

I guess all of us in this room, whether we be educators, administrators, or business people, consider ourselves good communicators. I guess I consider myself a good one -- in our business we're supposed to be -- and so I'd like to share an example of how effective one can be. A few years ago we did a story in Time on the American family, and we came to the conclusion that it was the strength of the society of our country and was, therefore, a good thing. We got a letter the following week addressed to Henry Luce, and it said "Dear Mr. Luce: My wife and I were contemplating divorce. After having read your story on the American family, my wife has decided not to divorce me. Please cancel my subscription." So much for the effectiveness of communication.

During the last few days you've heard from many people very well equipped to talk about education. What I have to say will be more of a general rather than a specific nature. I don't suppose there's anybody in the room who would disagree with me that education is and will remain the cornerstone of our democracy, and that it is through education that we produce people capable of debate, debate that in this country stimulates and motivates government policy. As one example, take the way foreign policy is conducted today.

We have a bigger constituency in this country than ever before. It can't be measured exactly, but some figures suggest the size. We have 17 million college graduates, another 9 million students in college. The three weekly news magazines have an unduplicated readership of about 35 million people. The problems of conducting foreign policy or any of our policies in front of such a large, quite well-informed constituency is something new to this country. Henry Kissinger in his gloomier moments has despaired that it is impossible to have a truly consistent foreign policy in a democracy, and he is sometimes accused of hankering after the good old days of Prince Metternich -- one autocrat who can say yes or no, one agent who can speak for the autocrat, and certainly no need to troop up to Capitol Hill to testify in front of six different committees and then have them all vote against you.

But I think that the formation of foreign policy, indeed the formation of any of the policies in our country in a wide-open democracy that happens to be a superpower, is an art and a relationship we have to figure out. I don't believe we're going to stop being a democracy, and I certainly hope we're not going to stop being a superpower. This is not just a problem for the Secretary of State or the Secretary of the Treasury or Secretary of

the Interior; it's a problem for each and every one of us in this room, because certainly the policies that they formulate will not work without your support. I suggest that one of the ideas and one of the strengths of this country is that government does not have a monopoly on wisdom and that input from people like you is going to make our decision-making process much more effective.

In the 1950s and the 1960s we made a great commitment in this country to extend higher education to a larger proportion of Americans, and that premise is being challenged in the 1970s. Certainly adjustments are going to be made in size, number, type, and curriculum in our universities, but the basic need for an expanded, enlightened people is there. Without going into a long list of reasons why I think there is great strength in this nation of ours, I can say that I do believe we are going to need a continued supply of highly skilled, highly educated people at least as far into the future as I can see. Therefore, perhaps I am a bit more optimistic than some of the critics of higher education we've been hearing of late.

I suppose that my industry can be somewhat to blame for the lack of optimism, because in the midst of violence and deprivation and political discord, some of the good news is scarcely noted. Let me just give you one statistic. In mid-October there were two indications of the abiding strength of our society. The gross national product rose by 11.2 percent on an annual basis for July, August, and September, the largest quarterly rise in two decades. This shows me that the United States is coming out of its long recession and is indeed in the midst of a recovery. At that same time we signed a five-year agreement with the Soviet Union to sell them a billion dollars worth of grain per year. Now that's not important in itself. But it is a reminder that the United States, in a resource-hungry world, remains a cornucopia. It is one of a very few nations that possess all the necessary ingredients for long-term economic power: a rich agricultural base, a vast supply of raw materials, big and modern industry, and a well-educated skilled population.

A word about the involvement in education of the private sector, where I've been involved for a good many years. As you know, an increasing demand for support of higher education in the private sector is upon us. It is growing, as any of you who are in the fund-raising business know, but I think support of the private sector is healthy and the one clear way in my view to maintain independent institutions of higher learning. Important as government is, we must constantly fight against its intrusion into academic life. Private-sector donators must also recognize their responsibility in this area. I don't believe that a large corporation or an individual who gives $100,000 should be allowed to catalog courses for the coming year. At the same time, I think that the institutions of higher learning in our country must take a look at the vast array of subjects they offer and put their own academic house in order. Education must reassume some of the disciplines of old without letting go of its new-found independence. I think university administrators today have responded tremendously to the demands for better fiscal control, and they should be commended. These demands certainly have added to the burdens of university presidents, but they in general have responded very well. And I think that bodes very well for the future of keeping that private sector so intimately involved in our higher education system.

Let me return to communications for a moment. Perhaps from a professional point of view, but also from the point of view of someone who worries about communications in terms of our entire society, I'd like to talk about a pet peeve. "The Americans," Walt Whitman wrote in the 1850s, "are going to be the most fluent and melodious voiced people in the world and the most perfect

users of words." I'm afraid that line was more hopeful than prophetic. Today, many people believe that the American language has lost not only its melody but a lot of its meaning. School children and even college students often seem disastrously ignorant of words. They stare, uncomprehending, at simple declarative English. A university president said, with glum hyperbole, "The English language is dying because it is not taught." Others believe that the language is taught badly and learned badly because the American culture is awash with cliches, officialese, political hogwash, and the surreal boob-speak of television. Lest I be considered parochial in my criticism of television, I would say that it has done a lot to make this country aware of a good many things, but I think it is part of our problem. With its chaotic parade of images, TV makes language subordinate, merely a part of the general noise, and it has certainly subverted the idea of reading as entertainment. Americans' vocabularies, both public and private, are being corrupted in part by a curious style of bombast intended to invest even the most banal ideas with importance. Discussing his institution's money troubles, a university president, who shall remain nameless, promises: "We will divert the force of this physical stress into leverage energy and pry important budgetary considerations and control out of our fiscal and administrative procedures." I think I know what he's saying, but it would take me a while to figure it out. That statement confirms the Confucian maxim that says that if language is incorrect then what is said is not meant, and if what is said is not meant then what ought to be done remains undone.

There are also those who consider the current breast-beating over language too pessimistic. A professor of comparative literature says language changes; the more it is used, the more it is abused. Some believe that the current outrage over abused English reflects snobberies of class and power. One sociologist says language is a power tool. I'm not sure that it isn't just the elite who have had power who are worrying over the loss of influence. But the fact that language is an instrument of power, whatever the current doubts about its effectiveness, should make Americans more attentive to it, not less. To a great extent, a people's language is its civilization. In a broad sense, education is what we are all about as a nation. I submit that a democracy such as ours is doomed if its people fail to become and remain enlightened.

On the eve of our 200th anniversary, how fares that democracy? Let me briefly give you a couple of my views on that, which I do believe tie in to our whole world of education. Perhaps I can express some of the challenges to educators for the future.

The founding of America was not just a political event -- the breaking away of some dissatisfied colonies from a short-sighted mother country. It was also an act of political philosophy and faith. It was a promise to the colonists, to their descendants, and to the world at large. The promise was contained in the Declaration of Independence: that people could govern themselves, that they could live in both freedom and equality, and that they would act in accord with reason, reason being a divine attribute, God's light for and in man. Not long ago a group of students in Indianapolis passed out copies to several hundred passers-by of the Declaration of Independence, and they asked them to sign it. Most people refused because they found the document "dangerous." Perhaps it's easy to laugh at them, but maybe in their own way they were saying that the Declaration is still a potent and even a radical document.

What has happened to our view of the Declaration of Independence since it stated the American promise? We know that chronologically it's still close.

Jefferson died when Lincoln was seventeen. Lincoln died when Woodrow Wilson was eight. And Wilson died when Gerald Ford was ten. But these haunting links of the generations matter little compared with the new American reality. Changes have taken place and brought about perhaps a crisis of the American promise. It seems to me it falls into three areas.

The first is the decline of our belief in reason as an instrument. Increasingly, we have substituted emotion for reason. Just look back at some of those slogans of the 1960s, such as "freedom now," or "non-negotiable demands." They're not so appalling for the goals they stated as for their irrationality.

A second danger to the American promise involves a conflict over self-interest. The founders' basic idea was that the pursuit of every man's self-interest was the most reliable motivation on which to build a political system, provided it was rightly understood and curbed by political checks and balances. But today more than ever, we see growing numbers of individuals and groups simply fighting for their immediate interest and gain without regard for the goals or even the survival of the society as a whole. In a democracy there must be an interaction between leaders and followers. In that sense, leaders must be led.

A third threat to the American promise concerns equality. The Declaration's assertion that all men are created equal has always been the most embattled of its self-evident truths. But gradually there has developed what might be called a respectable American consensus that all people are or should be equal in intrinsic human dignity, equal before the law, and should have equal opportunities in education and employment. We obviously have not lived up to that consensus, although considerable progress has been made toward it. But even as we struggle, more or less sincerely, to improve equality of opportunity, a new and alarming demand is being put forward -- a demand for equality of result. In brief, this demand is based on the theory that natural inequalities of birth, strength, intelligence, and ability are inherently unfair and that justice requires society to compensate for such inequalities. This leads logically to the elimination of meritocracy, to quotas in education and other fields, and, perhaps, to drastic redistributions of income. I am not suggesting that that day is upon us, but it is possible, and each one in this room should consider what the consequences might be.

I've tried to outline a few of the things that occur to me on the eve of our 200th anniversary that I think are directly related to your great jobs as educators. And I'd like to suggest one more that has nothing to do with you as educators, but as Americans. Here we are on the eve of our 200th birthday, and as I have suggested we are perhaps a little creaky. What worries me as much, and perhaps even more, is that we're more than a little cranky. Therefore, I suggest that along with all the clarion calls to duty and the like we need nothing so much as to recover our national sense of humor. And I would like to suggest to this audience that you go in search of it. There could be no greater service than to revive the American capacity to laugh. We did that all through our history, and let's not forget the contribution that humor made to the morale of our people in times of stress.

And we ought to recapture that wonderful ability to laugh at ourselves. Our public men and women particularly should regain that ability, because God knows some of them appear ridiculous enough at times to cause us to laugh. I suggest that at least my own belief in them would be greatly enhanced if they would join me from time to time. John Kennedy had that ability. When he was President, Time did a story about Robert Kennedy in which we referred to Bobby Kennedy as the second most powerful man in the United States. Hugh

Sidey, who was Washington Bureau Chief for a time, who had done the story, had an appointment with the President the morning that week's issue came out. As he walked into the Oval Office, President Kennedy was on the phone. He put his hand over the receiver, looked at Sidey kind of sorrowfully, and said "It's Bobby, the second most powerful man in the world, on the line." And then he put the receiver up to his ear, listened a bit more, took it down, put his hand over the receiver, and said "Bobby wants to know who number one is."

The American promise of self-government and freedom under law, with self-restraint, remains the most stirring and hope-giving in the catalog of political systems, and certainly the most fragile. What is needed for its survival is a rigorous concentration on its meaning, including a concentration on some things perhaps the Declaration of Independence left out. Freedom, like the Declaration itself, is not a gift but a permanent demand on us to keep giving. Perhaps in our minds we should insert some words like the following into the Declaration: "that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inescapable duties and that among those duties are work, learning, and the pursuit of responsibility." For it seems to me that our attitude toward work still determines the kind of life we deserve. Our willingness to learn means an open mind both to the new and the old, and it is necessary to keep liberty real. A sense of responsibility, rather than hedonism alone, is necessary for that elusive goal of happiness. And finally, only the willingness to perform certain duties can guarantee our rights.